

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
7 AT SEATTLE

8 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 RYAN FLETCHER,

12 Defendant.  
13

Case No. CR19-227RSL

ORDER DENYING  
DEFENDANT'S MOTION  
FOR EARLY  
TERMINATION OF  
SUPERVISED RELEASE

14 This matter comes before the Court on defendant's "Motion for Early Termination of  
15 Supervised Release" (Dkt. # 122).<sup>1</sup> The Court, having reviewed the motion, records, and files  
16 herein, as well as the relevant factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), DENIES defendant's  
17 motion.

18 "[A]fter considering a subset of the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), a  
19 court may terminate a term of supervised release 'if it is satisfied that such action is warranted  
20 by the conduct of the defendant released and the interest of justice.'" *United States v. Emmett*,  
21 749 F.3d 817, 819 (9th Cir. 2014) (quoting 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1)). "The expansive phrases  
22 'conduct of the defendant' and 'interest of justice' make clear that a district court enjoys  
23 discretion to consider a wide range of circumstances when determining whether to grant early  
24 termination." *Id.* (quoting 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1)).  
25

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Defendant has requested oral argument. Dkt. # 122. The Court concludes that oral argument is  
unnecessary to its disposition of the motion. *See* Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(b)(4).

1 Here, while the Court commends defendant for the strides he has made during his period  
2 of supervision, it concludes that given defendant's recent violations, *see* Dkt. # 123 at 1 (noting  
3 that defendant failed to appear for drug testing on or about June 23, 2023, July 21, 2023, and  
4 August 18, 2023), and the limited time remaining on his term of supervised release, *see id.*  
5 (explaining that defendant's term of supervision is scheduled to expire on October 3, 2023),  
6 early termination is not warranted here. Defendant's motion for early termination (Dkt. # 122) is  
7 therefore DENIED.

8 The Court finds compelling reasons justify sealing defendant's motion and amended  
9 motion containing sensitive information (Dkts. # 120 and 122). Defendant's motions to seal  
10 (Dkts. # 119 and 121) are accordingly GRANTED.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12  
13 DATED this 8th day of September, 2023.

14  
15 

16 Robert S. Lasnik  
17 United States District Judge  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27